

REMARKS:

The continuation application is filed to claim the invention fully disclosed in the original application filed September 19, 2001. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to allow all of the claims in view of the remarks set forth below.

The term "each of said plurality of individually addressed segments has a length significantly greater than its width" in claims 33, 54, and 59 is supported in the specification at, for example: (1) page 1, line 4 of the "Summary of the Invention" section that states "the segments are a series of RGB lines or stripes"; and (2) FIG. 2 which shows the segments 204, 206, 208, 210, 212, and 214 (in FIG. 2, the segments are RGB lines).

With regards to (1), the specification states that "the segments are a series of RGB lines or stripes" and it is known to one of ordinary skill in the art that a "line" or "stripe" has a "length significantly greater than its width". The on-line dictionary at the website "www.dictionary.com" defines "line" as "a mark that is long relative to its width" (underlining added). In addition, the on-line dictionary defines "stripe" as a "long narrow band". The dictionary defines "narrow" as "small or limited width, especially in comparison with length" (underlining added). This shows that the statement "the segments are a series of RGB lines or stripes" found in the specification provides adequate support to one skilled in the art for the claim term "segments has a length significantly greater than its width".

With regards to (2), FIG. 2 shows the segments as RGB lines 204, 206, 208, 210, 212, and 214. Each of these segments (i.e., lines) has a length significantly greater than its width. A drawing can provide the written description of the invention. *See, for example, Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1991); and MPEP § 608.04. Since the drawing (i.e., FIG. 2) can provide the written description for a claim, there is adequate support to one skilled in the art for the claim term "segments has a length significantly greater than its width".

In the parent application, the Examiner rejected the claims based on the disclosure of U.S. Patent No. 6,014,119 issued to Staring et al. ("*Staring*").

Applicants submit that *Staring* does not disclose the organic light emitting diode ("OLED") light source claimed in any of the claims, specifically, claims 33, 54, and 59. For example, Applicants submit that claim 33 claims "[a]n OLED light source" used for general purpose lighting but *Staring* pertains to a display as shown by the reference in the specification, figures, and claims to a display and to the pixels of the display. The display is

different than a light source used for general purpose lighting because, for example, the display is used to show information but the light source is not well suited for displaying information, but rather is used, for example, to light a certain area. As explained in the “Background of the Invention” section of the patent application, the design and manufacturing considerations are different when producing a “light source for general purpose lighting” versus producing a “display”. The display disclosed in *Staring* is made of multiple pixels, however, the OLED light source of previously amended claim 1 is comprised of multiple “segments”. In previously amended claim 1, each of these segments has “a length significantly greater than its width”, however, each of the pixels disclosed in *Staring* have a substantially square shape. For example, in column 1, lines 65-67; column 2, lines 27-32; and FIG. 1, *Staring* discloses that each of the pixels is formed by the intersection of the strip-shaped electrodes resulting in the pixel having a substantially square shape.

For claim 41, Applicants submit that *Staring* does not disclose that the “second electrode is a shared continuous electrode” (support for the “continuous electrode” is provided in the original specification at, for example, page 6, lines 12-14). Rather, *Staring* discloses that both electrodes are patterned into a strip-shape. For example, in column 2, lines 28-30; column 3, lines 13-21; FIG. 1; FIG. 2; and FIG. 11, *Staring* discloses that there are two patterns of electrode layers, one is a column of electrodes and the other is a row of electrodes.

For claim 42, Applicants submit that *Staring* does not disclose that “said first electrode is a shared continuous electrode.” Rather, as shown earlier, *Staring* discloses that both electrodes are patterned into a strip-shape.

Also, for claims 43, Applicants submit that *Staring* does not disclose that “said first electrode and said second electrode are aligned parallel to each other” (support for the electrodes being parallel to each other is provided in, for example, FIG. 1, where the conductor line 106 is parallel to the conductive layer 112). *Staring* discloses that the first electrode and the second electrode overlap such that these electrodes are, for example, perpendicular to each other (i.e., electrodes that overlap cannot be “aligned parallel to each other”). See, e.g., column 1, lines 63-67. For example, as shown in FIG. 1, the column of electrodes (i.e., the “m” number of columns) are perpendicular to the row of electrodes (i.e., the “n” number of rows). The column of electrodes aligned perpendicularly to the row of electrodes is also shown in FIG. 2 and FIG. 11 in which the electrodes 13 are aligned perpendicular to the electrodes 12.

For claim 49, *Staring* does not disclose “each of said segments has a linear shape.” In *Staring*, each of the pixels has a substantially square shape rather than a “linear shape” (for details, refer to the discussion above for claim 33). Support for claim 49 is found in the original specification and drawing at, for example: (1) page 1, line 4 of the “Summary of the Invention” section that states “the segments are a series of RGB lines or stripes”; and (2) FIG. 2 which shows the segments as RGB lines 204, 206, 208, 210, 212, and 214.

For claim 50, *Staring* does not disclose “each of said segments extends the full active area of said OLED light source.” In *Staring*, the boundaries of each pixel of the display is the areas of overlap of the two electrodes. Each pixel, however, does not extend the full active area of the display. Support for claim 50 is found in the original specification at, for example, page 7, lines 23-30.

For claim 51, *Staring* does not disclose “said first patterned electrode belonging to one of said individually addressed segments is not shared with another one of said individually addressed segments.” In *Staring*, however, both the electrodes of one pixel are shared with other pixels. For example, in FIG. 3, the pixel P_{11} has as its electrodes row 1 and column 1. The pixel P_{12} also has as its electrodes row 1 and column 1, therefore, the row 1 is shared by both the pixels P_{11} and P_{12} . Similarly, the pixel P_{21} has as its electrodes row 2 and column 1, therefore, column 1 is shared by both the pixels P_{11} and P_{21} .

For claim 52, *Staring* does not disclose “said second patterned electrode belonging to one of said individually addressed segments is not shared with another one of said individually addressed segments.” In *Staring*, however, both the electrodes of one pixel are shared with other pixels (see the explanation above with regards to claim 52).

For claim 53, *Staring* does not disclose “said first patterned electrode and said second patterned electrode belonging to one of said individually addressed segments is not shared with another one of said individually addressed segments.” In *Staring*, however, both the electrodes of one pixel are shared with other pixels (see the explanation above with regards to claim 52).

CONCLUSION:

This preliminary amendment modifies the application to indicate that it is a continuation and adds new claims to more fully claim the invention disclosed in the original application filed on September 19, 2001.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference call at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Date: Oct. 15, 2003

Respectfully requested,

SIEMENS CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department
Telephone: (732) 321-3026

By: Thomas George
Thomas George
Registration No. 45,740
Attorney for Applicants
Tel: 650-694-5191
Fax: 650-968-4517